

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

FRANK TAYLOR, JR.  
Plaintiff,

v.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT G.W.H.C.F.,  
DELAWARE COUNTY PRISON, et al.,  
Defendants.

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

CIVIL ACTION

No. 04-0600

OPINION

AND NOW, this 17th day of May, 2011, upon consideration of Plaintiff Frank Taylor's Memorandum of Law (Doc. No. 102), Defendants' Memorandum in Response (Doc. No. 105), and the Settlement Agreement reached between the parties in this case,<sup>1</sup> the Court concludes that Plaintiff's contention that his claims against District Attorney Michael Green, Assistant District Attorney Coley Reynolds, Deputy District Attorney Daniel McDevitt, Detective Paul Corsi, and Judge Richard Cappelli survived the Settlement Agreement lacks merit.

In the Settlement Agreement reached by the parties, Plaintiff released Delaware County and any of its "directors, officers, employees, agents, subsidiaries, affiliates, contractors, attorneys, insurers, executors, administrators, successors, predecessors, trustees, assigns, and any other person, agency, department, company or entity who may be liable for the acts . . . from any and all liability and all manner of actions" that Plaintiff ever had against them. He accordingly released from liability the individuals listed above, as they were all employed by Delaware County when the events giving rise to Plaintiff's causes of action against them took place.

---

<sup>1</sup>At the Court's request, Defendants' counsel provided it with a redacted copy of the Settlement Agreement reached between the parties on January 21, 2011 so that the Court could consider what, if any, claims remained.

Accordingly, the Court's March 16, 2011 Order dismissing this case with prejudice pursuant to Local Rule of Civil Procedure 41.1(b) stands and this matter shall remain closed.<sup>2</sup>

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Legrome D. Davis

Legrome D. Davis, J.

---

<sup>2</sup>Plaintiff complains that the five defendants listed above were never served with his Second Amended Complaint. Though true, Plaintiff's decision to release this individuals from liability means that their failure to be served is irrelevant.